

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

May 3, 1999

LB 382

absolutely clear to me as the writer of the amendment in large measure, I think there may be some dispute, but I certainly see it that way. Secondly, on the demand for general obligation bonds, Senator Chambers has said this, and he said it so many times that I've decided to take some time here to say, no, that isn't exactly right. Senator Raikes was very accurate in his description. What he said is, we don't want people to believe that the state will come in and save them and that there is some kind of obligation on our part that, you know, the city of Omaha and their voters can assume exists, and for that reason, should they choose the use of the bond...the general obligation bond mechanism, they need to do that before they come to the application so that they go to the community without an application that's been approved, without confirmation from the state that we will be there to help them out in some way. However, in Section 4, it identifies how a political subdivision could use the revenue bonds to acquire, construct or operate. If you use the revenue bonds, you floated those, you could acquire, you could construct, you could operate, and then you could come for a state "turnback". But, if you are going to use general revenue bonds, there you have to have an approval of the general obligation bonds that would be used for this purpose, and that would have to be part of your application. In other words, if a city could afford this on its own with no bonds, they could come for "turnback". If the city could do this on revenue bonds, they could come for "turnback". If they choose to use general obligation bonds, they have to go out, sell that, pass that, and bring that as part of the application with them to the application for the throwback. I, by the way, would say it's not because the body feels no concern over these amendments, it's because the amendments that Senator Chambers offers us have no consequences. I do think there are places where Senator Chambers' analysis could improve the language of this bill, he's pointed out several. And it would be foolish of me not to acknowledge that we could write sections of this bill better. And if he'd allow us to get to it, I bet we'd do it. But I think it's part of his plan to keep us on amendments of no consequence so that we couldn't clarify. And if we have to live with the bill in its current form, I think we could do that and achieve appropriate goals, and with sufficient language and with sufficient guidance for a court to interpret this bill in a way that would be consistent with the Legislature's expected use of